

## REMARKS

Claims 39-58 remain in the present application. Claims 13-16, 18-22, 24-29, 31-35 and 37-38 are cancelled herein. Claims 39-58 are added herein. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added as a result of the claim amendments. Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the arguments set forth below.

### Examiner Interview Summary

A telephonic Examiner Interview was conducted on October 14, 2009 between Examiner Cory Almeida and Applicant's representative Bryan M. Failing. It was agreed during the Examiner Interview on October 14, 2009 that the cited combination of Penz and Daly does not appear to teach or suggest the combination of elements as recited in Claim 39 including "wherein said multi-component display further comprises a component operable to generate light" and "wherein a position of said second region of said second display screen is aligned with a position of said first region of said first display screen to selectively control an amount of said light associated with said first region," the combination of elements as recited in Claim 46 including "a component operable to generate light" and "wherein a position of said second region of said second display screen is aligned with a position of said first region of said first display screen to selectively control an amount of said light associated with said first region," the combination of elements as recited in Claim 52 including "wherein said multi-component display further comprises a component operable to generate light" and "wherein a position of said second region of said second display screen is

aligned with a position of said first region of said first display screen to selectively control an amount of said light associated with said first region.” Applicant thanks the Examiner for conducting the interview.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 13-16, 18-22, 24-29, 31-35 and 37-38

Claims 13-16, 18-22, 24-29, 31-35 and 37-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over United States Patent Number 4,364,039 to Penz (referred to herein as “Penz”) in view of United States Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0090455 to Daly (referred to herein as “Daly”). Claims 13-16, 18-22, 24-29, 31-35 and 37-38 are cancelled herein, and thus, Applicant respectfully submits that a discussion of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of Claims 13-16, 18-22, 24-29, 31-35 and 37-38 is moot.

Claims 39-58

It was agreed during the Examiner Interview on October 14, 2009 that the cited combination of Penz and Daly does not appear to teach or suggest the combination of elements as recited in Claim 39 including “wherein said multi-component display further comprises a component operable to generate light” and “wherein a position of said second region of said second display screen is aligned with a position of said first region of said first display screen to selectively control an amount of said light associated with said first region,” the combination of elements as recited in Claim 46 including “a component operable to generate light” and “wherein a position of said second region of said second display screen

is aligned with a position of said first region of said first display screen to selectively control an amount of said light associated with said first region,” the combination of elements as recited in Claim 52 including “wherein said multi-component display further comprises a component operable to generate light” and “wherein a position of said second region of said second display screen is aligned with a position of said first region of said first display screen to selectively control an amount of said light associated with said first region.” As such, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 39, 46 and 52 are not rendered obvious by the cited combination of Penz and Daly. Since Claims 40-45, 47-51 and 53-58 depend from and recite further elements of the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 40-45, 47-51 and 53-58 are also not rendered obvious by the cited combination of Penz and Daly. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 39-58 are allowable.

#### General Remarks

The additional limitations recited in the independent claims or dependent claims are not further discussed as the above-discussed limitations are believed to be sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art of record. However, Applicant respectfully reserves the right to respond to one or more of the Examiner’s rejections in subsequent amendments should conditions arise warranting such responses.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 39-58 are in condition for allowance and Applicant earnestly solicits such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 11 / 9 / 2009

/BMF/

Bryan M. Failing  
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
(408) 938-9060